

"You have done a fine job of getting Senators to support the legislation I know you endorse to make Columbus Day a legal public holiday. I can't do more about that observance unless Congress acts."

Mr. Chairman, we are further heartened by the cosponsorship of S. 108 by the outstanding and devoted hard-working majority leader of the U.S. Senate, the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, and yourself—in this case, I had said, yourself, referring to Senator DIRKSEN.

I should like to enter into the RECORD a quote from your letter to our Mr. Errigo. This is from Senator DIRKSEN to Mr. Errigo of Wilmington, Del.:

"I can assure you that the moment the pending Senate filibuster has ended and we can proceed to organize Senate Committees that this bill will have immediate consideration. I will do my best to move it to the Senate Calendar for quick action so that it can then go to the House and then to the President for signature."

Mr. Chairman, we all recognize that the Congress has been hard at work on many serious and not uncomplicated problems in the domestic and foreign fields. Our first scheduled hearing had to be postponed. A terrifying and most sad catastrophe befell the American people in the tragic assassination of our sympathetic leader and President, the Honorable John Fitzgerald Kennedy. May his immortal soul rest in eternal peace.

However, I believe that we are indeed fortunate to be able to say that it is not too late because it is evident from the message I have previously read that our President Johnson also stands ready to affix his signature to this legislation upon passage by the Congress.

In other testimonials, the Honorable Senator BEALL said this for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on October 10, 1963:

"We Americans take pride in the discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus, not only for his courageous journey into uncharted seas, against great odds, and his pressing on despite mutinous crew and other handicaps, but also for his bringing to these shores the Christian faith."

The following is taken from the proclamation by the Honorable Theodore McKeldin, mayor of Baltimore:

"We take pride in this great Italian navigator who brought to our shores the Christian faith and whose memory renews our dedication and purpose to meet the challenges we, as a nation, confront both here and abroad."

And then while I served as treasurer of the State of Connecticut, I had the pleasure of meeting the Honorable J. Millard Tawes, present Governor of the State of Maryland, and I have a short quote from his proclamation on Columbus Day in 1963:

"Whereas, Christopher Columbus stands today as an alltime outstanding exemplar of such courage, such faith, and such vision; and

"Whereas, courage, faith and vision, and the guiding hand of God, brought Christopher Columbus to this hemisphere of ours, and opened the sea lanes for those who came after him, eventually to establish the United States of America; and

"Whereas, because this great son of Italy contributed so much to those of us who are privileged to be Americans and, through the United States, to the world in general." And that closes that part of the proclamation.

From Prof. Gino Gallozzi, a member of our Boston Lodge of the Sons of Italy, he writes as follows, and I wish to submit his statement:

"One hundred and eighty-seven million people from all walks of life cannot ignore

the fortitude and the courage of the man who defied the New World 472 years ago.

"Were it not for the discovery of this great continent, 187 million people in the United States would not be able to pay homage to Thanksgiving Day and to the Father of our Country.

"Were it not for the discovery by Columbus, the great shaft of the Statue of Liberty with the ever-glowing torch held aloft would not be enlightening the world from this Western Hemisphere."

The foregoing testimonials clearly indicate that Columbus Day is and should be important and dear to the minds and hearts of all Americans and cannot be regarded as being the care and concern of any single segment of this great melting pot of races.

Then there is a matter of a number of States that had this adopted and I will submit information collected from the Library of Congress.

Now, what is the record through the years with our Congress on this legislation? In every Congress, commencing with the 72d in 1931 and through and including this year, the 88th Congress, legislation seeking to add Columbus Day to the list of our permanent national holidays has been introduced. In 13 Congresses prior to the current one, I am very sorry to report, no action was taken on this legislation.

In my opinion, this is a sad report. This is an unfair and unjust report to this great hero, this great benefactor of all Americans to the present day who followed him and found their new destinies upon these hallowed shores.

Before closing this statement, I should like to submit one more opinion, which comes from one of our brother in our order and of whom we are quite proud. He is Dr. Nicholas Petruzzelli, an economist with the Export-Import Bank.

On this question, Dr. Petruzzelli wrote in part as follows:

"It is the consensus of authoritative opinion that the discovery of the New World by Columbus marked the commencement of a great renewal of the human spirit. His success encouraged other discoveries and opened new windows to science and to all knowledge. The discovery of America changed the course of history, and to no man since the coming of Christ does the world owe so great a debt as to Columbus. It would be fitting, therefore, that the United States of America should claim the immortal name of Christopher Columbus as her very own by making the date of his discovery of the New World a national public holiday."

The challenge is presented now fairly and squarely to this Congress. It has, in my opinion, and I offer this opinion most humbly and respectfully, risen to great heights in resolving issues of great importance and most beneficial for the future welfare and prosperity of the American people.

I urgently submit to you that this Congress should not again permit this opportunity to pass. I ask for your favorable report of S. 108, and further to exert all of your energies to bring about its passage in both Houses and its transmittal to the President, where I am confident, it will finally be signed and proclaimed into law to the everlasting credit and endearment in the hearts of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

Speaking for myself, personally, and for the membership I have the honor to represent, I thank you for this opportunity to appear before your honorable committee.

Senator, I will submit copies of this statement, copies of the material gathered from the Library of Congress, and copies of our national publication, in which we indicate the interest of the order, the membership I represent, in this bill.

HOUSTON POST EDITORIAL PAYS TRIBUTE TO MRS. ANNE BYRD

Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. President, the sadness and heartfelt sympathy we share in the passing away of Mrs. Anne Byrd, wife of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, HARRY FLOOD BYRD, have been expressed with tenderness and sorrow by a leading Texas newspaper, the Houston Post.

In tribute to the life of a great lady, who shared the work and the great responsibilities of our colleague, Senator BYRD of Virginia, I ask unanimous consent that the Houston Post editorial of Monday, August 31, 1964, captioned "Mrs. Anne Beverley Byrd," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston Post, Aug. 31, 1964]

MRS. ANNE BEVERLEY BYRD

Mrs. Anne Douglas Beverley Byrd, who died at her home in Virginia the other day, was a gracious wife and mother who could be—and was—at home and at ease in a Governor's mansion, at Washington social and political affairs, and amid the blossoms of a vast apple orchard.

During her half century of marriage to Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD of Virginia, she watched history unfurl as her husband served successively as State senator, Governor, and U.S. Senator. At Rosemount, the Byrd home near Berryville, she was hostess on frequent occasions to the Nation's leaders. She played an active role in the family apple growing business.

Her death brought sorrow to all who had the privilege of knowing her. Their sympathy goes out to Senator BYRD and to her sons and grandchildren.

FORBES MAGAZINE WRITES OF BUSINESS SUPPORT FOR HUBERT HUMPHREY

Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. President, the qualities of our colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] that have so endeared him to us will be made well known to the country during the coming weeks. We can predict that no voter will be immune to the intelligence and charm of this legislative dynamo. As an illustration of the impact his personality makes on all who come in contact with our friend, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an interesting appraisal of Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, under the title "Is It Senator HUMPHREY?", written by Malcolm S. Forbes, and published in Forbes magazine, a magazine of business, of August 1, 1964. This article demonstrates that HUBERT H. HUMPHREY has widespread business support and is not the candidate alone of a limited segment of our economy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACT AND COMMENT: IS IT SENATOR HUMPHREY?

(By Malcolm S. Forbes)

Ever since President Johnson took the oath of office last November, Americans by the millions, have speculated about his choice of a running mate this November. Toward

the end of this month the game will be over, the selection made.

Who will it be?

Your guess is as good as mine—and vice versa. I strongly doubt if the President himself has as yet made his final decision.

Increasingly often at the top of the most "informed" guess-lists is the name of Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota. If not the speculators' first possibility, he is usually No. 2, almost never lower than third.

What sort of a man is this whom fate or the march of time could well make the next President of the United States?

I found him to be in fact considerably more than the man I thought he was. Articulate, not glib; principled, not preachy; determined, not dogmatic; a man with an ebullient, deep-down faith in the goodness of his fellows, a faith apparently untarnished by the cynicism that inevitably accompanies success in politics.

His liberalism is real but not wild-eyed or far-out. He obviously no longer believes, if he ever did, in push-button legislative solutions to complex problems.

Fascinatingly enough, he is at once a favorite of the Adlai Stevenson spectrum and increasingly one of the favorite Senators of informed businessmen. In talking with a Forbes reporter about HUMPHREY, New York Stock Exchange President Keith Funston said, "If I had to name one of a half-dozen people in Washington who would have been against us, HUBERT HUMPHREY would have been at the head of the list. But I found out a couple of years ago he was a real capitalist. The business community had the wrong picture of him."

About the improving climate between business and government, HUMPHREY says this: "I am not for monopolies or price fixing, everybody knows that. But that kind of stuff isn't good for business either. I think the day of harassment of business by government is over. . . . For years business has looked on government as a natural enemy, that's fading now. . . . I think you have to have a favorable political climate to have a good economic climate."

Last week I flew to the Chicago Club to be present when Senator HUMPHREY met and spoke off the record with 2 dozen of the country's topmost business leaders, gathered by Sears, Roebuck president, Crowds Baker. I was amazed to see Gen. Robert Wood present and told him so. This venerable curmudgeon of the right, his eyes twinkling, quickly set me straight.

"I am just back from the San Francisco convention. It was the greatest I ever attended. We finally fixed you easterners. Why am I here? I'm thrilled with BARRY GOLDWATER, but if Johnson should be re-elected, I'd feel safer with HUBERT HUMPHREY as Vice President."

This one-time chief of Sears went on: "I disagree with most of his ideas but if fate put him in the White House, I could go to sleep knowing we had on the job an honest man who truly loves his country."

The great difference between the HUBERT HUMPHREY who entered the Senate 16 years ago and the HUBERT HUMPHREY who, with a couple of others, runs the Senate today is simply summarized: While his liberal convictions have not melted, he himself has mellowed, matured.

"If I believe in something," he says, "I will fight for it with all I have. But I do not demand all or nothing."

"Professional liberals want the fiery debate," says he. "They glory in defeat. A sort of political masochism. The hardest job for a politician today is to have the courage to be a moderate. It is easy to take an extreme position."

After the Chicago confab, I flew to Washington with the Minnesotan and four of his young aids. They were a happy, bright, believing group. Obviously dedicated to their

boss, they clearly felt his future and theirs indeed lay ahead—just ahead. Come August 24 and then November 3, they could turn out to be quite right.

At least that's the way it looks to this Republican.

THE WHEAT PROGRAM

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, recently there have been many charges to the effect that the current wheat program authorized by this Congress has had the effect of lowering wheat prices below what might have obtained had the program not been enacted. The Department of Agriculture has come in for much criticism on the ground that its so-called meddling, or, on the other hand, so-called inaction on behalf of farmers, has helped to depress wheat prices below previous levels.

The number and frequency of such charges, and the fact that my State harvests a substantial acreage of wheat, led me to investigate the accuracy of the charges. A recent inquiry of mine to the Agriculture Department resulted in a very informative report on the situation, written by Mr. H. D. Godfrey, the Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, of the Department of Agriculture.

The report indicates that those who allege that the Government has failed in its duty to maintain a higher level of wheat prices forget or overlook the fact that the adverse votes of the same wheat farmers, in the May 1963 wheat referendum, not only killed mandatory acreage controls on wheat, but also stripped the Department of Agriculture of authority to protect the incomes of wheat farmers at previous levels.

The report points out that opponents of the present program who blame alleged low prices on the Government continue to ignore these basic facts about the wheat program:

First. That as a result of the defeat of marketing quotas, in the wheat referendum of last year, price supports for the 1964 wheat crop would have established the price at \$1.26 a bushel, had it not been for the action of Congress in placing the supports at the present \$1.30 level, 4 cents a bushel higher than would otherwise have been the case.

Second. That market prices for wheat have historically followed closely the level of price supports, and that—contrary to some of the allegations made recently—only during and immediately following World War II, when wheat was in short supply, have market prices been as much as 10 cents a bushel above the support level.

Third. That there is a substantial surplus of wheat, with the Commodity Credit Corporation holding an inventory of approximately 900 million bushels—almost 2 years' domestic food consumption. The total supply of wheat available for the current marketing year—1964 crop, plus carryover—is approximately 2.2 million bushels—far in excess of the estimated domestic and export requirements of 1.3 billion bushels. These figures, when simply stated, mean that in the absence of the current wheat program, the total supply available to affect

the current marketing year would have been at least 100 million bushels larger.

Fourth. That there are no factors in either the domestic or world supply-and-demand picture which would give reason to believe that buyers of wheat would have been paid much more than the \$1.26 support rate for the 1964-crop wheat.

On the basis of these facts, it should be quite clear that, instead of reducing farm income from wheat, as charged, the new program, which increased price supports from \$1.26 to \$1.30 a bushel, and provided certificate and diversion payments to participating producers, in fact resulted in an actual increase in the 1964 income of wheat farmers. It has been conservatively estimated that the increase in total income to wheat farmers nationally will amount to around \$450 million.

Mr. President, I thank the Administrator, Mr. Godfrey, and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service for their help in clearing away these charges and allegations, and for getting through to the true facts concerning the current wheat program.

CUBA AS A STATE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the writer of the book of Ecclesiastes did not know my good friend, Henry A. Dennis, president and editor of the Henderson Daily Dispatch, of Henderson, N.C. If he had, he would never have asserted that there is nothing new under the sun.

The Henderson Daily Dispatch for August 21, 1964, carried an editorial, by Henry Dennis, entitled "Cuba as a State," which suggests, as the ultimate solution of the Cuban problem, that Cuba should ultimately be admitted to the Union, as the 51st State. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial making this novel suggestion be printed at this point in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CUBA AS A STATE

This may sound ridiculous but then again it might conceivably have greater merit than appears on the surface. It is the possibility that by some strange quirk of events Fidel Castro might be gotten out of the picture and, by assent of the people, Cuba become the 51st State in the American Union. How it could be brought about, or even if it could be, we have little idea.

Since Alaska and Hawaii have been admitted to the sisterhood of States in recent years, a development of this character might have been more feasible before the Communist dictator took over in Cuba 5 years ago. Alaska and Hawaii were, of course, already territories of this country and because of that didn't have as far to go. But it seems odd that the idea was never considered in the decades prior to the dictatorship and subsequently the sellout to Soviet Russia.

Cuba is only 90 miles from the coast of Florida. Hawaii is 2,000 miles out in the Pacific from the mainland, and Alaska almost as distant to the north. But they are States today.

The present regime in Cuba is a thorn in the flesh to the United States and will always be so long as it is directed from Moscow, thousands of miles away. Cuba, as part of this Nation, could become an important factor in our national defense. As a State, people from the mainland would be free to

1964

travel back and forth. The tourist trade itself would almost support a State government in Cuba, as it would become a favorite resort in winter.

Cuba as an integral part of the United States would enter upon the greatest era of development and prosperity it has ever experienced and far more than it is likely ever to achieve as a satellite of the Kremlin.

All this has the ring of the fantastic. And it may be all of that. But Cuba is much nearer the mainland than Puerto Rico, which would like very much to become the 51st State. It is odd that such an approach to an irritating problem has never received any thought here, at least none that we have ever heard of.

The whole thing may be a crackpot idea, but it really isn't as fanatical as it may sound on the surface. Such a development might create new headaches, but certainly it would ease a lot of others. If the proposal were held out to the Cuban people, they might conceivably take matters in their own hands to bring it about. Although he would be downgraded in the extreme, the thought could possibly find some lodgment in the brain of Castro himself.

THE RESEARCH TRIANGLE INSTITUTE NEAR DURHAM, N.C.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Durham Sun, of Durham, N.C., for August 4, 1964, published an interesting article concerning the Research Triangle Institute near Durham, N.C., which is doing so much to promote economic and scientific research. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the article be printed at this point in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RTI HAS NEAR \$16 MILLION IMPACT ON AREA'S ECONOMY

(By Don Whitley)

Research Triangle Institute (RTI) near Durham has an economic impact on the three-country area in which it was founded of nearly \$16 million annually.

The impact derives from personnel paychecks only. It does not include additional moneys spent locally for equipment, materials, and supplies used at the Institute.

The research center has a current annual payroll of \$1,790,500. Based on industrialists' estimates of each dollar changing hands 8 times within the community, present salaries produce an economic impact of \$15,764,000.

RTI's salaries represent livelihoods for 210 households, or 735 people based on the national estimate of 3.5 persons per household. When the Institute was founded in 1959, the professional staff of 35 people, represented only 122 family members.

Over half—58 percent—of the people associated with RTI live in Durham County. Thirty-six percent of these live in the city of Durham. Others live in Wake, 20 percent; and Orange, 18 percent; the other two counties composing the triangle area. The remaining 4 percent are nonpermanent residents.

RTI has attracted to North Carolina, and the three-country area, professional scientists from nine countries including India, Afghanistan, Australia, Canada, Great Britain, Germany, Japan, and Yugoslavia.

Three RTI staff members presently are in Nigeria working on a research project for a U.S. Agency for International Development.

Of the present 210 member permanent staff, two-thirds (140) are professional persons, ranking in the scientist levels. Of

this 140 staffers, another two-thirds (94) are trained beyond the college graduate level, and from this number, one-half (70) hold Ph. D. degrees.

RTI officials say the number of professional employees here is exceptionally high for an enterprise with a 210 member staff, but the operation of the Institute requires persons well versed in a wide variety of subject areas, and specially trained in certain fields of research.

Value of buildings occupied or under construction, plus equipment owned by the Institute, totals over \$2.5 million. Laboratory and office equipment alone is valued in excess of \$700,000. Three buildings are completed and in continuous use. These include the Hanes Building—used for administration offices, the Dreyfus Laboratory Building, and building No. 3, used for laboratory and experimental research.

Presently under construction is the William Trent Ragland Building at a cost of \$480,000. The building is designed to afford 32,000 square feet of working space. When the Ragland Building is completed, the Institute will occupy 95,000 square feet of workspace in its four buildings.

Research contracts acquired by RTI through the year 1964 total \$12,505,000. Projected revenue to the Institute through contract projects will exceed \$3 million.

Since the Institute is a nonprofit enterprise, all revenues above salaries are expended on services, supplies, equipment, and a major part into construction of new facilities.

RTI is regarded by many business leaders as one facet of North Carolina's answer to challenges of an emerging and expanding industrial economy. A major attribute to its being founded here was the concentration of three major universities—the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill, Duke in Durham, and North Carolina State in Raleigh—forming a triangle with less than 30 miles on a side.

RTI president, Dr. George L. Herbert, says "The success of the Research Triangle Institute is measured by the extent to which its research programs contribute to total national and regional efforts and add to the world's fund of basic knowledge."

In addition to scientific and industrial advancements, RTI contributes to cultural enrichment of the three counties in which it is formed, and to North Carolina. The exceptional number of staff members trained high in the ranks of education bring with them wives, most of whom also are college trained, and potential college graduates in their children.

RTI is one of four research centers already established in the 5,000-acre Research Triangle Park located in parts of Durham, Wake, and Orange Counties. Others include Chemstrand, the National Association of Colorists and Chemists, and a Southeastern Forestry Experimental Station.

Each of the research centers employs highly trained staffs, and each affords greater cultural enrichment for the area, along with greater potentials for boosting the area's economy since education is the basic consideration for earning power.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GRUENING OF ALASKA BEFORE THE CANADIAN-AMERICAN ASSEMBLY, HARRISON HOT SPRINGS, BRITISH COLUMBIA, AUGUST 21, 1964

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on August 21, 1964, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] addressed the Canadian-American Assembly at Harrison Hot Springs, British Columbia.

In delivering this address, the Senator made a worth while and informative contribution to the cordial relations already existing between Canada and the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to have the address of the Senator from Alaska printed in the RECORD, as well as a letter which the Senator from Alaska subsequently received from Clifford C. Nelson, president of the American Assembly at Columbia University, New York City.

There being no objection, the address and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING, DEMOCRAT, OF ALASKA, BEFORE THE CANADIAN-AMERICAN ASSEMBLY AT HARRISON HOT SPRINGS, BRITISH COLUMBIA, AUGUST 21, 1964

Friends of the Western Canadian-American Assembly, ladies and gentlemen, some 21 years ago a distinguished Canadian, long in his country's service and then a member of the Dominion's subcabinet, was visiting me in the Governor's mansion in Juneau, Alaska.

In the course of our conversations, I exhibited the ignorance concerning Canada which, as a characteristic of Americans generally, it is now widely asserted, is one of the Canadians' grievances against us.

My ignorance took the form of a questioning of my Canadian guest.

"Tell me," I asked, "just what is a Canadian? What is his feeling about his nationality? Does he consider himself a transplanted Britisher? Or does he have as strong a nationalistic and prideful feeling as a Canadian as we have as Americans? Do you Canadians have a militant sense of your nationhood?"

His reply, given with a smile, was: "Well, we haven't been able to make up our minds yet what our flag should be."

That was 21 years ago. And perhaps I should apologize retroactively in the presence of Canadian friends gathered on the hospitable soil of Canada for so gauche a catechizing of a most delightful visitor.

However, 21 years later the flag issue appears not only unsettled, but somewhat more acute.

But that should not cause any concern. Our American flag has been changed repeatedly. Some of us are particularly proud of the changes made in 1959 and 1960, when we added the 49th and 50th stars and more-over staggered the arrangement of the stars. By these acts, let me digress to say we extended the frontiers of democracy to our farthest west, north, and south, into the Eastern Hemisphere and into the Arctic. Which makes me wonder why the proposed new Canadian flag does not also carry a blue stripe on top to recognize the Arctic Ocean, one of the great airways and subseaways of the immediate future. The United States and Canada appear to be the only nations fronting on three oceans. Since your flag could, if it were so wished, recognize that striking geographic fact, why not consider it?

To return to my subject, I note, also, as having some pertinence, Prof. Douglas Le Pan's opinion in his "Canadian View" of the outlook for the relationship between our two countries that "most Canadians would admit that Canada has not yet succeeded in creating a clearly recognized national identity."

A different view is, however, expressed by the Honorable Paul Martin, Secretary of State for External Affairs, who, while addressing the 25th American Assembly last April, stated: "There is a national purpose in Canada, there is a national integrity, there is a determination to pursue that."

I have further confession to make. And if confession is good for the soul, mine will be much improved on this occasion. For I must confess to having been guilty also, on the one previous occasion when I discussed Canadian-American relations, of what I now learn is not only a cliché, but a cliché passé, and worse.

Addressing a joint Dominion Day and Fourth of July celebration at Edmonton in 1942, organized in the enthusiastic aura of the construction of the Alaska Highway—then known as the Alcan—I referred glowingly to the 3,000 miles of undefended boundary which, I suggested, separated but did not divide our two nations.

That now appears to have been a faux pas extraordinary, rendered even more obsolescent and solecistic by the historical and geographical subsequent amendment that it has become 4,400 miles of undefended boundary, running not merely east and west, but also north and south.

My retrospective mortification is compounded by the discovery in the course of a careful reading of the statement of findings and recommendations of the Western Canadian-American Assembly of last April that not fewer than five of the seven contributing experts chastise such allusions with joyful piquancy.

Thus, Prof. Mason Wade, of the University of Rochester, refers to "that postprandial favorite," "that favorite topic of afterdinner orators," and characterizes as "a hardy and persistent myth that the tradition of the undefended frontier . . . goes back to the Rush-Bagot agreement."

Thus, also, Prof. James Eayrs, of the University of Toronto, refers to "that famous unfortified frontier without fulsome reference to which no international bridge could be opened and no afterdinner speech" be "complete."

Likewise, President John Wendell Holmes, of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs, declares flatly that "we have bored the world too long with sermons about our unfortified frontier" and that in this nuclear age it has become "an irrelevant symbol."

And President John Sloan Dickey, of Dartmouth College, calls for "at least equal time" for the less alluring symbol of "the unequal border" rather than "the undefended border."

I found a more sympathetic treatment of this obviously common error of which so many of us in our naive unawareness have been guilty in Prof. Jacob Viner's reaction, namely, that while "many Canadians, even some scholars, are casting ridicule on the traditional phenomenon of ceremonial speeches at Canadian-American gatherings which harp on the mutual good will of the two peoples, on the unguarded common boundary, on the common values and objectives and cultures of the two peoples," nevertheless such good will is not to be scorned.

This theme I should like to explore a bit further. I recall an aphorism of Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes to the effect that "reiteration of the obvious is often more useful than elucidation of the obscure."

So, I will venture my faith and confidence in the obviously uniquely favorable aspects of our relationship, our common heritage of law and custom, our common faith in the basic freedoms—of speech, of assembly, of press, of worship, the prime ingredients of democracy; our fundamental similarities of thought, morals and aspirations; our common language. I do not overlook that Canada has two official languages, and in that respect is much richer than we. This is a solid base on which an edifice of fuller understanding can and will be built, and I wholly agree with Professor Viner that all this is not to be scorned. Quite the contrary. We should both rejoice in it and utilize it to the fullest extent.

But wait. Am I once more falling into fallacy? Again no less an authority than Secretary of State Paul Martin, in his aforementioned address, declared:

"A mistake will be made if it is thought that between us there is not a great deal of difference"; and elaborating, he said: "An American would make a great mistake if he thought that because of the similarities, because of the common enjoyment of so many of the incidentals of our society and our civilization, there was not fundamentally a difference between us. There is."

Well, praise be. Diversity should be one of the great goals of a free society. Of nothing should Americans or Canadians be prouder than of the diversities that exist within their respective societies. So why not diversity and differences, also, as between neighbors. We have plenty of them in our 50 States. So have you in your nine Provinces and territories. And how much better the diversities—those varied forms of untrammelled self-expression—that freedom can engender than the enforced conformance imposed in a totalitarian state or the drab and stodgy conformity of an inert and custom-bound society.

Unawareness by Americans of this difference, and indeed a larger unawareness by Americans of Canada in general—of Canadian problems, needs, and aspirations—appears to be one of the Canadians' grievances against their southern neighbor. I say, "appears to be," because I find it difficult to convince myself that so negative a quality can be magnified into a major grievance. But, as it has been categorically affirmed by men steeped in the issues of Canadian-American relations, I hesitate to voice my doubt. Of course such unawareness does exist, and the reason for it has been amply explained.

First, a much smaller proportion of Americans than Canadians live close to the border—indeed the overwhelming majority of Canadians live within 200 miles of it, forming a narrow transcontinental population belt, while Americans, spreading southward for over a thousand miles, allow their gaze and interest to wander elsewhere.

Second, Canada's economic and to a degree its political future are bound closely to American policy any performance, and largely dependent on them, while there is no nearly equal American dependence on what Canada does.

As Prof. Mason Wade pithily summarizes it: "Canada is only one of many problems for the United States, while for Canada the United States is the problem."

I agree that based on these geographic and economic factors, a marked difference in the awareness of Americans about Canada and in the awareness of Canadians about the United States is a fact.

But, in this time of better communications and educational potentials, is this not a problem that can be diminished by concerted effort?

The regrettable fact is, and it is pertinent, that Americans are also ignorant about themselves. I can speak feelingly and from personal experience about their ignorance—our ignorance—about my State—Alaska: Alaska, incidentally, a closer neighbor to Canada than to the rest of our Union, than to what we in Alaska call "the lower 48," or, in a vainglorious mood, "the smaller 48." We haven't quite accustomed ourselves yet to say 49.

That ignorance, just like our ignorance about Canada, has both historical and geographic origins. It goes back to the purchase of Alaska from Russia in 1867—the same year which gave birth to the Canadian confederation.

Ignorance at the time of its acquisition caused Alaska to be labelled with many harsh names. It was called Icebergia, Seward's Polar Bear Garden, Walrusia—a pun on the

country which sold Alaska and one of our noble mammals—but the epithet which endured longest is "Seward's folly."

At the time of the debate in the Congress concerning Alaska's purchase, Alaska was pictured as a desolate arctic waste, unfit for human habitation. The Treaty of Cession was adopted by our Senate by only a one-vote margin, and when, in the following year, 1868, the House of Representatives was called upon to appropriate for the payment—the vast sum of \$7,200,000, less than 2 cents an acre (in retrospect, what a bargain)—these misinformed views as to Alaska's worthlessness were amply aired. Had not the United States already taken possession of Alaska a year earlier, thus confronting the House of Representatives with a fait accompli, it is doubtful whether the transaction would have been approved.

Now if this display of some American legislators' ignorance and likewise of some of the press of that day were just an antiquarian footnote to history, it would be merely amusing, but this misconception continued to haunt Alaska and its relations with its adopting parents throughout Alaska's 92 years of territorialism.

It caused Congress to neglect Alaska shamefully. It gave Alaska no legal government whatever during its first 17 years under the American flag. During these years—from 1867 to 1884—no hopeful settler (and many of them came there hopefully) could acquire a title to land; no pioneer could clear a bit of the forested wilderness and count on the fruits of his toil, or build a long cabin with the assurance that it was his; no prospector could stake a mining claim with security for his enterprise; property could not be deeded or transferred; no will was valid; no injured party could secure redress for grievances except through his own acts; crime could not be punished. Perhaps, worst of all, marriage could not be celebrated—a cruel injustice to the lovelorn. Yet life somehow went on without benefit of legal sanction.

In this connection, it is pertinent to record a great and useful act of friendship performed for Alaska by their Canadian neighbors in the days of their common political infancy. In the absence of any government for Alaska created by a distant and uninterested Congress, such authority as there was, was exercised de facto for the first 10 years by the commanding officer of the U.S. Army stationed at Sitka. But when, in 1877, he and his troops were called back to put down an uprising of the Nez Percé Indians in Oregon Territory, there remained not even that semblance of authority in Alaska. The idea of an Indian uprising was contagious. This was a year after the massacre of General Custer and his men by the Indians led by Sitting Bull in Montana Territory. The relations between the military in Alaska and the surrounding Tlingit Indians had left much to be desired. The white settlers there, in deadly fear of an Indian uprising, implored their distant Government in Washington to send up some kind of a war vessel to overawe any possible uprisers and to protect them from massacre. No attention whatever was paid to these insistent and increasingly urgent pleas. Abandoned, they felt, by their own Government, the settlers, in genuine alarm and fear, appealed to their Canadian neighbors. Their cry for help, sent by mail (this was before the days of telegraph or cable), and addressed to "the captain of any one of Her Majesty's Ships stationed at Esquimaux," was promptly responded to in good neighborly fashion by Capt. H. Holmes A'Court, who, without waiting for instructions, proceeded northward on the vessel under his command, the H.M.S. *Osprey*. His arrival in Sitka was hailed by its inhabitants, and he remained there for 34 days until a U.S. sloop-of-war finally ar-